



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

TH
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,571	11/09/2001	Wayne M. VanLandingham	P04853US0	4035

27139 7590 03/28/2003

MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.
ATTN: MAYTAG
801 GRAND AVENUE, SUITE 3200
DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721

EXAMINER

HARRIS, ERICA B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3634

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/036,571

Applicant(s)

VANLANDINGHAM, WAYNE M.

Examiner

Erica B Harris

Art Unit

3634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

1. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

The specification to which the oath or declaration is directed has not been adequately identified. See MPEP § 601.01(a).

It does not identify the city and either state or foreign country of residence of each inventor. The residence information may be provided on either on an application data sheet or supplemental oath or declaration.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: reference line “6-6” is not shown in Figure 2 as referenced on page 3, line 8.
3. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 6 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities: in claims 6 and 13, line 2, “are stepped” should be --is stepped-- to agree with “each”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Fiocca et al.* (3,752,322). In Figures 1-4, *Fiocca* illustrates a dishwasher rack 20 comprising a bottom; a front; a back; and opposite sides, each of which are formed from a plurality of rods 24 and 26 that extend across the bottom of the rack and up each side. The rack further comprises first and second horizontal legs 37 extending along the bottom; a plurality of stepped tines 38 extending from each of the first and second legs; both of the legs 37 being pivotally mounted on the bottom such that the tines thereon are foldable between upright and lowered positions; and a clip member 45 adapted to engage one of the foldable tines 43 to hold the foldable tines in a position between the upright and lowered positions. The tines 38 on the first leg 37 are independently foldable with respect to the tines 38 on the second leg 37. Clip member 45 further includes a plurality of protrusions 52,54 that are adapted to receive an arm 43 on the one foldable leg 37 to hold the tines 38 in a selected position. The lower ends of the tines on one leg are fixed relative to the tines on the other leg and the upper ends of the tines of the respective legs are spaced progressively farther apart from one another as one or both of the legs are pivoted to fold the tines thereon from the upright position to the lowered position.

Art Unit: 3634

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 5, 6, 12, 13, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiocca *et al.* as applied to claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-20 above, and further in view of Smith (5,351,837). Fiocca *et al.* discloses all of the limitations of these claims with the exception of the tines being angled rearwardly. Smith, in Figure 1, illustrates a dishwasher rack 10 having a plurality of rearwardly angled tines 16 that are stepped, as shown at 17. To one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious angle the tines of Fiocca *et al.* rearwardly, as taught by Smith, in order to orient items mounted on said rack such that they would lean toward the rear of the rack.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Finola *et al.* (5,601,195), Friskney (4,917,248), Remmler (5,649,630) are cited to further illustrate the current state of the art of dishwasher racks having foldable tines.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erica B Harris whose telephone number is 703-306-9071. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5:30 M-F.

Art Unit: 3634

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel P Stodola can be reached on 703-308-2686. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3597 for regular communications and 703-872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-2168.



Erica B. Harris
March 20, 2003



DANIEL P. STODOLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600